UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,054	11/25/2003	Carol Jeffcoate	HO2-0002	7777
, ·	7590 04/05/201 /CANTOR COLBURN	EXAMINER		
Patent Services		CHUO, TONY SHENG HSIANG		
101 Columbia Road P.O. Box		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Morristown, NJ 07962-2245			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/05/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com USPTOPatentMail@cantorcolburn.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/723,054	JEFFCOATE, CAROL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tony Chuo	1795				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 M	larch 2010.					
	action is non-final.					
· <u> </u>	/ 					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-28</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-28</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
<u> </u>	ar.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	atent Application					

Art Unit: 1795

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 3/19/10, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) claim 12-28 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made in view of Farkash et al and Houlberg.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claims 27 and 28 recite the limitation "fuel cell assemblies" and "the at least one fuel cell assembly" in lines 2, 3, and 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1795

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 12, 16, 17, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) and as evidenced by Houlberg (US 2004/0137295).

Regarding claims 12, 27, and 28, the Farkash reference discloses a method of controlling a temperature of a fuel cell system, the method comprising: detecting a temperature of plate "208" (measuring the operating temperature of fuel cell assembly adjacent to the thermoelectric layer at one or more locations across the fuel cell assembly); and in response to the detected temperature, controlling a power source to provide power to resistive temperature device "254" (thermoelectric device) as needed to maintain the plate "208" at a predetermined temperature, thereby heating end plate "226" (See paragraph [0095]). It also discloses regulating the supply of electrical power to heating elements to maintain end plate at the operating temperature of the fuel cell stack (See paragraph [0086]). It also discloses that the heatable ends help to maintain the temperature of the fuel cell stack at a desired temperature and uniform along the length of the stack (See paragraph [0031]). It also discloses controlling the heating of the end plates according to a predetermined operation such as a feedback loop which

Art Unit: 1795

implies that fuel cell assembly is heated and cooled until the desired temperature is stabilized (See paragraph [0097]).

Examiner's note: It is inherent that controlling a power source to provide power to resistive temperature device comprises adjusting a voltage of a power source to the resistive temperature device to heat or cool the fuel cell assembly in contact with the thermoelectric layer. As evidenced by Houlberg, resistive heatable element, adapted to heat the end cell of the fuel cell stack (power source), connected in parallel to the fuel cell stack, whereby the heat output of the resistive heatable element increases as the voltage of the fuel cell stack increases and decreases as the voltage of the fuel cell stack decreases, thereby heating the end cell when the heat output increases and cooling the end cell when the heat output decreases (See paragraph [0039] and claim 16).

Regarding claim 16, it also discloses a fuel cell assembly that is a proton exchange membrane fuel cell (see paragraph [0072]).

Regarding claim 17, it also discloses contacting a periphery of the fuel cell with an end plate "226" that is construed as a heat sink (See paragraph [0095]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1795

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Kaneko (JP 06-318736). The Farkash reference is applied to claim 12 for reasons stated above.

However, Farkash et al does not expressly teach thermoelectric devices that are Peltier devices. The Kaneko reference teaches a method of controlling the temperature of a substrate by using a thin film Peltier thermoelectric element (See paragraph [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash method of controlling a temperature of a fuel cell stack to include thermoelectric devices that are Peltier devices in order to utilize a thermoelectric device that allows for the temperature control of a bigger heating value. In addition, the substitution of one known thermoelectric device for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Keegan (US 2003/0003339). The Farkash reference is applied to claim 12 for reasons stated above.

However, Farkash et al does not expressly teach a power source that is a battery. The Keegan reference discloses a power source that provides power to heat fuel cell interconnects comprising a battery (See paragraph [0028],[0029]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash method of controlling the

temperature of the fuel cell stack to include a power source that is a battery in order to utilize a suitable power source that is typically external to the fuel cell assembly and used in combination with the fuel cell assembly. In addition, the substitution of one known power source for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Houlberg (US 2004/0137295). The Farkash reference is applied to claim 12 for reasons stated above.

However, Farkash et al does not expressly teach a power source that is the fuel cell assembly. The Houlberg reference discloses resistive heatable elements (thermoelectric element) that is electrically connected to the fuel cell stack (See paragraph [0039]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash method of controlling the temperature of the fuel cell stack to include a power source that is the fuel cell assembly in order to more efficiently utilize the power generated by the fuel cell stack to maintain the fuel cell at a uniform temperature. In addition, the substitution of one known power source for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

12. Claims 18, 19, 21, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Enjoji et al (US 2004/0101728).

Art Unit: 1795

The Farkash reference discloses a method of controlling a temperature of a fuel cell system, the method comprising: providing an end plate in thermal contact with a periphery of the fuel cell stack; detecting a temperature of plate "208" (measuring the operating temperature of fuel cell assembly adjacent to the thermoelectric layer at one or more locations across the fuel cell assembly); and in response to the detected temperature, a controller that controls the power source to provide power to resistive temperature device "254" (thermoelectric device) as needed to maintain the plate "208" at a predetermined temperature, thereby heating end plate "226" (See paragraph [0095]). It also discloses regulating the supply of electrical power to heating elements to maintain end plate at the operating temperature of the fuel cell stack (See paragraph [0086]). It also discloses that the heatable ends helps to maintain the temperature of the fuel cell stack at a desired temperature and uniform along the length of the stack (See paragraph [0031]). It also discloses a temperature sensor assembly including a sensor that is a thermocouple (See paragraph [0094]). It also discloses a fuel cell assembly that is a proton exchange membrane fuel cell (see paragraph [0072]). Examiner's note: It is inherent that controlling a power source to provide power to resistive temperature device comprises adjusting a voltage of a power source to the resistive temperature device to heat or cool the fuel cell assembly in contact with the thermoelectric layer.

However, Farkash et al does not expressly teach a step of providing one or more thermoelectric layers in between adjacent fuel cell assemblies in the fuel cell stack; or a step of measuring the start-up temperature of the fuel cell assembly in contact with a

thermoelectric layer. The Enjoji reference discloses the steps of providing a heating mechanism "84b" between adjacent fuel cells "82m" and "82m-1" and measuring the temperature of the fuel cell during warm up which is the start-up temperature of the fuel cell (See paragraph [0064] and Figure 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash method of controlling the temperature of the fuel cell stack to include a step of providing one or more thermoelectric layers in between adjacent fuel cell assemblies in the fuel cell stack; and a step of measuring the start-up temperature of the fuel cell assembly in contact with a thermoelectric layer in order to provide a method of warming up the fuel cell stack in which the fuel cell stack can be warmed up reliably in a short period of time with a simple process (See paragraph [0010]).

13. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Enjoji et al (US 2004/0101728) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Kaneko (JP 06-318736).

However, Farkash et al as modified by Enjoji et al does not expressly teach thermoelectric devices that are Peltier devices. The Kaneko reference teaches a method of controlling the temperature of a substrate by using a thin film Peltier thermoelectric element (See paragraph [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash/Enjoji method of controlling a temperature of a fuel cell stack to include thermoelectric devices that are Peltier devices

in order to utilize a thermoelectric device that allows for the temperature control of a bigger heating value. In addition, the substitution of one known thermoelectric device for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

14. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Enjoji et al (US 2004/0101728) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Keegan (US 2003/0003339).

However, Farkash et al as modified by Enjoji et al does not expressly teach a power source that is a battery. The Keegan reference discloses a power source that provides power to heat fuel cell interconnects comprising a battery (See paragraph [0028],[0029]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash/Enjoji method of controlling the temperature of the fuel cell stack to include a power source that is a battery in order to utilize a suitable power source that is typically external to the fuel cell assembly and used in combination with the fuel cell assembly. In addition, the substitution of one known power source for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

15. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkash et al (US 2001/0036568) in view of Enjoji et al (US 2004/0101728) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Houlberg (US 2004/0137295).

However, Farkash et al as modified by Enjoji et al does not expressly teach a power source that is the fuel cell. The Houlberg reference discloses resistive heatable elements (thermoelectric element) that is electrically connected to the fuel cell stack (See paragraph [0039]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Farkash/Enjoji method of controlling the temperature of the fuel cell stack to include a power source that is the fuel cell in order to more efficiently utilize the power generated by the fuel cell stack to maintain the fuel cell at a uniform temperature. In addition, the substitution of one known power source for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Chuo whose telephone number is (571)272-0717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Michener can be reached on (571) 272-1424. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1795

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TC

/Jonathan Crepeau/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795